Case 1:18-cr-00834-PAE Document 157 Filed 04/11/19 Page 1 of 25 1

035	SHERC	
SOU	TED STATES DISTRICT COURT THERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
	TED STATES OF AMERICA,	
	V.	18 CR 834 (PAE)
DAN	IEL HERNANDEZ,	
	Defendant.	
	x	
		New York, N.Y.
		March 28, 2019 3:00 p.m.
Before:		
	HON. PAUL A. ENGI	ELMAYER,
		District Judge
	APPEARANCE	S
GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York		
BY: JACOB E. WARREN Assistant United States Attorno	У	
DAWN M. FLORIO		
LANCE LAZZARO Attorneys for Defendant		

1 (Case called) 2 MR. WARREN: Good afternoon, your Honor. 3 Jacob Warren on behalf of the United States. 4 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Warren. MS. FLORIO: Good afternoon, your Honor. 5 6 Dawn Florio of the Dawn Florio Law Firm representing 7 Mr. Daniel Hernandez. 8 MR. LAZZARO: Good afternoon, your Honor. 9 Lance Lazzaro for Mr. Hernandez. 10 THE COURT: Very good. Good afternoon, Ms. Florio. 11 Good afternoon, Mr. Lazzaro. 12 Good afternoon to you, Mr. Hernandez. 13 You may all be seated. 14 Ms. Florio, I gather you may be more comfortable standing? 15 MS. FLORIO: Actually, sitting is better. 16 17 THE COURT: That's fine as well. 18 Good afternoon as well to the members of the public 19 who are here. 20 All right. We are here today so that the court can 21 conduct a Curcio hearing with respect to Defendant Daniel 22 Hernandez. The specific issue is whether Mr. Hernandez is 23 prepared to make and whether he can make a knowing and informed 24 waiver of any potential conflict presented by his

representation by Mr. Lazzaro.

For the benefit of all here, I am going to briefly describe what this issue is and how it came about. I don't intend to review here the full history of the issue. Those interested can consult the transcript of the docket, including of the pretrial conference at which the issue first arose and the various court orders and the filings that have ensued.

Briefly, though, Mr. Hernandez was initially represented jointly by Mr. Lazzaro and by Ms. Florio. At an early conference, it came to light that Mr. Lazzaro previously had represented not one, but two of Mr. Hernandez's codefendants in this case, in both of those instances in criminal cases in state court.

These defendants were a Kifano Jordan and Faheem Walter. This fact came to light not because the court had been alerted by Mr. Lazzaro to the fact of those prior representations, rather Mr. Lazzaro's prior representation of Mr. Jordan came to light in the course of a Curcio that had been convened with respect to a separate conflict issue involving Mr. Jordan's counsel, an issue which those counsel had affirmatively brought to my attention. My followup questions then brought to light the fact that Mr. Lazzaro had had a previously undisclosed representation of another codefendant, Mr. Walter.

At that point, the court understood Mr. Lazzaro to stand down from participating in this case, from representing

Mr. Hernandez in this case, until the potential conflict issues had been sorted out. Ms. Florio since then has been sole counsel for Mr. Hernandez. That was including in connection with Mr. Hernandez's guilty plea on January 23, 2019, opportunity to a plea agreement that included a cooperation provision.

On February 21, 2019, after the issuance of a superseding indictment and an arrest pursuant to it, the transcript of Mr. Hernandez's guilty plea was unsealed. In the ensuing two months, the court has taken several steps to ensure that the interest of all three potentially effect and defendants -- Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Walter -- are protected.

Both Mr. Jordan and Mr. Walter initially moved to dismiss the superseding indictment on the theory that it might have been tainted in some way by information provided by Mr. Hernandez that derived from Mr. Lazzaro's earlier representations of Mr. Jordan and/or Mr. Walter.

The court considered that motion, including by means of reviewing the government's submissions regarding the circumstances leading it the superseding indictment. The court ultimately denied that motion as baseless.

The court later gave Mr. Jordan and Mr. Walter the opportunity to move to disqualify Mr. Lazzaro from representing Mr. Hernandez. Neither of them did so. The court also took

steps to enable it independently to determine whether

Mr. Lazzaro's representation of Mr. Hernandez in this case
jeopardized the interests of Mr. Lazzaro's former clients,

Mr. Jordan and Mr. Walter. The court directed Mr. Lazzaro to
submit a lengthy declaration recounting in detail the nature
and circumstances of those prior representations and to attach
any records that he retained reflecting privileged
communications with either of those former clients.

Mr. Lazzaro promptly did so.

Upon review of those submissions, the court determined that the subject matter of Mr. Lazzaro's prior representations were not factually connected to the present case, which involves racketeering and other charges relating to an entity that, as alleged, is called the Nine Trey Gangsta Bloods.

The court also determined that Mr. Lazzaro, based on his submissions, is not privy to any privileged communications of either of his prior clients that could be relevant here.

So that brings us to today. On March 22, I issued an order stating we are now down to a single issue that must be resolved before Mr. Lazzaro may resume his representation of Mr. Hernandez. The remaining issue solely concerns the interests of Mr. Hernandez, as they may be affected and were to be represented by a lawyer, Mr. Lazzaro, who previously represented two people who are now codefendants of his in this case.

I should add, by way of factual update, that earlier this morning, Mr. Jordan pled guilty before this court to two firearms charges. The case against him will now proceed to sentencing. That does not eliminate the potential conflict, of course, but it narrows, at least as to Mr. Jordan, the context in which Mr. Hernandez might be in a position to give adverse testimony that could theoretically be affected by the counsel and advice of Mr. Lazzaro.

With that long preface, which hopefully is clarifying for all concerned, I propose to proceed in this order, and I don't expect the hearing to take long.

I will first want to understand from Ms. Florio, the non-conflicted counsel for Mr. Hernandez, what discussions she has had with Mr. Hernandez to assure that he is educated about the conflict at issue. I want to understand essentially the amount of time that you've taken with him and the ways in which you've gone about educating him as to what the issue is. The reason, of course, is that under Curcio, a court is to extend to the defendant an opportunity to confer about a potential conflict issue with a non-conflicted lawyer.

Ms. Florio, we have had the good fortune, you've already been in the case and are well familiar with the circumstances. You were the obvious person to appoint to guide Mr. Hernandez on that issue. It's my hope that if the hearing goes as counsel have indicated they expect it to, Mr. Hernandez

may indicate that he is satisfied with your independent counsel on that issue, which in turn might obviate a need for a second hearing to allow time for that sort of consultation.

In any event, after I speak with Ms. Florio, I will then have Mr. Smallman swear Mr. Hernandez, and I will then question Mr. Hernandez substantially along the lines of the proposed colloquy that the government has filed, but with some additional questions. And the goal of that questioning will be to make sure, Mr. Hernandez, that you understand the potential ways — potential emphasized here — the potential ways in which your representation by Mr. Lazzaro could potentially be adversely affected because of the fact of Mr. Lazzaro's previous representation of the two codefendants of yours.

With that, over to you, Ms. Florio. Just can you tell me what communications -- thank you, Mr. Hernandez -- that you have had with Mr. Hernandez by way of walking him through the conflict thinking?

MS. FLORIO: As soon as the conflict issue had arisen, I met many times with Mr. Hernandez, just me and him by ourselves, and I explained what the conflict -- what the potential conflicts could be, what his options are.

I specifically had indicated to him, for example, if he wouldn't -- this is if he wouldn't have pled guilty and everyone would have gone to trial -- that anything that

Mr. Lazzaro had learned during his representation of Mr. Jordan

and Mr. Walter, that that could not be used to cross-examine Mr. Kifano, Mr. Kifano Jordan and Mr. Walter.

So he understood that. He accepted that. He waived any potential, you know, conflict with respect to that particular issue. We have exhausted all the other issues of the potential conflicts in this case. He understands everything with respect to what is happening here today. He has asked me many questions, I've answered all of his questions, and we have gone over all the proposed questions from the government, which he understands, and he's prepared to answer truthfully all of your Honor's questions.

THE COURT: Approximately how many times have you met or spoken with Mr. Hernandez about the conflict issue?

MS. FLORIO: About six.

THE COURT: Most recently when?

MS. FLORIO: Today.

THE COURT: Are you confident that he understands the nature of the conflict issues presented?

MS. FLORIO: I am super confident.

THE COURT: That is good to hear.

Let me identify an area or two just to make sure that you recall going over it with him.

The government identifies in its proposed examination this possibility, which is that Mr. Lazzaro might have some information that he's obtained from Mr. Jordan or from

USSSIERC

Mr. Walter that could be helpful to Mr. Hernandez at some point in this representation, but that he would be prohibited from using that information because he owes a duty of confidentiality to his former clients.

Is that one of the potential conflicts you have gone over?

MS. FLORIO: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Look, I'll identify another one, which is as follows: It is obviously a public fact that Mr. Hernandez is party to a cooperation agreement. One possibility is that to the extent Mr. Lazzaro feels an ongoing duty or sense of obligation to his former client, it is at least theoretically possible that Mr. Lazzaro's guidance to Mr. Hernandez about what to share with the government and how to share it and how to put it could be affected by the way it would make Mr. Lazzaro's former clients.

Look, of course I'm not suggesting that Mr. Lazzaro would, in any way, shirk on his obligations to Mr. Hernandez, but if he ever felt in some way that there was a tension of conflict between the interests of his former clients and the interest of his present ones, that is the purpose of the Curcio inquiry. It could lead a lawyer in that position to steer the client not to say as damaging things about the codefendants as the facts might warrant. That is a theoretical possibility.

Is that a scenario you've gone over?

MS. FLORIO: We have gone over that as well.

THE COURT: Have you gone over with Mr. Hernandez this scenario, which is that if, in theory, a conflicted lawyer steered him or led him or encouraged him to provide less than fully truthful information to the government, that could jeopardize his ongoing cooperation relationship, it could lead the government to reconsider it?

MS. FLORIO: We have discussed that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you confident that Mr. Hernandez is fully aware and understands those potential risks?

MS. FLORIO: I'm super confident.

THE COURT: Look, I want to make clear that in identifying these risks, these do not in any way, shape, or form bear on Mr. Lazzaro. Whoever was party to the prior representation, I would be asking exactly the same questions. The important thing is that the client understand that, regardless of the character, nature of the person, of the lawyer involved, those are risks that are inherent in the situation Mr. Hernandez proposes to be in, which is to say having a lawyer who previously represented people against whom Mr. Hernandez is potentially positioned to cooperate.

MS. FLORIO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Very good.

Ms. Florio, anything further you want to share with me about your discussions with Mr. Hernandez about the Curcio

issue?

MS. FLORIO: Your Honor, all I can tell you is that we have extensively exhausted every possibility. I've met with him numerous occasions, and actually, I was present with most of the proffer agreements and I've been with Mr. Hernandez from the very beginning, and we have spoken privately about this issue and he is ready to proceed.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Let me thank you, while I have you, for the service you provided as sole counsel to Mr. Hernandez during the two plus months in which you've been acting alone.

MS. FLORIO: Thank you.

THE COURT: With that, I'm going to have Mr. Smallman, please swear Mr. Hernandez.

Mr. Hernandez, would you please rise.

(Defendant sworn)

THE COURT: Mr. Hernandez, you may be seated. Just kindly move the microphone close to Mr. Hernandez.

Mr. Hernandez, I am going to ask you just a few background questions. The purposes of these questions is to solely make sure that I can satisfy myself that you understand what is going on here today and that there is nothing interfering with your ability to understand.

All right. I've asked you a few of these at a prior proceeding. I'm just going to start right from the top.

J3SsHERc 1 How old are you? 2 THE DEFENDANT: 22, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. The last education you've 4 received is? 5 THE DEFENDANT: GED. 6 THE COURT: GED. 7 What was the last year in which you attended school? THE DEFENDANT: I believe the eleventh grade. 8 9 THE COURT: Where was that? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Legacy High School. THE COURT: When did you get the GED? 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: I received it, I believe, April 10 of 2018. 13 14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 15 Are you currently taking any medications? THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. Are you currently under the 18 care of a doctor or a psychiatrist? THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: In the past 24 hours, have you taken any 21 alcohol, medications, drugs of any form? 22 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

is interfering with your ability to understand what is

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything today that

23

24

25

happening here today?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I was watching you while I was speaking to Ms. Florio and you seemed very alert and locked in on what she and I were saying to each other.

Were you able to understand that conversation?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand what the purpose is of today's proceeding?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Florio, do you have any doubt as to your client's competence to engage in a Curcio inquiry today?

MS. FLORIO: I have no doubt.

THE COURT: Government, how about you?

MR. WARREN: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hernandez, I'm now going to pivot to asking you questions about the role of Mr. Lazzaro.

If at any point you want to confer with Ms. Florio, feel free to do so.

THE DEFENDANT: OK.

THE COURT: First of all, I'm aware that Mr. Lazzaro represented you in this case up to the point when I ordered him to step aside.

Focusing on that period up to the point where I asked him to step aside, were you satisfied with the services that he provided to you up to that point?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.		
2	THE COURT: All right. Has Mr. Lazzaro informed you		
3	that he previously represented your codefendants Kifano		
4	Jordan and Faheem Walter in prior state court criminal		
5	proceedings?		
6	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.		
7	THE COURT: And at what point did he inform you of		
8	that?		
9	THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Jordan was the one who referred me		
10	to Mr. Lazzaro for a state case that I had.		
11	THE COURT: I see.		
12	So on account of Mr. Jordan's referring you, you		
13	understood that Mr. Jordan had used Mr. Lazzaro as a lawyer		
14	before?		
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.		
16	THE COURT: All right. When did you become aware that		
17	Mr. Lazzaro had represented Mr. Walter before?		
18	THE DEFENDANT: Um, about um, October, um I		
19	think I don't know if it was October or November of 2018.		
20	THE COURT: So the fall?		
21	THE DEFENDANT: In or about.		
22	THE COURT: In the fall, you became aware of that		
23	prior representation?		
24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, before I was arrested for this		
25	crime.		

1 THE COURT: How did that come up? 2 THE DEFENDANT: I quess Mr. Lazzaro made an appearance 3 for Mr. Walter, it was like a one -- one-time thing. 4 THE COURT: Unrelated to this case? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: All right. You were aware at that time of 7 Mr. Lazzaro's representation of Mr. Walter? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: All right. Do you understand that the 10 fact that Mr. Lazzaro previously represented Mr. Jordan and 11 Mr. Walter and likely had conversations with them that are 12 likely covered by attorney-client privilege? 13 Do you understand that that could lead him to have 14 divided loyalties between yourself and those two former clients 15 of his, do you understand that that is a possibility? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. I want to identify for you, 18 along the lines of the conversation I had with Ms. Florio, a couple of examples of ways in which Mr. Lazzaro's prior 19 20 representation of those two people or his privileged conversations with them might adversely affect his 21 22 representation of you or might limit the things he can do on 23 your behalf. 24 First of all, are you aware that it is possible that

Mr. Lazzaro has information from Mr. Jordan or Mr. Walter that

25

might be helpful in representing you in this case, but that he 1 is prohibited from using that information because of his duties 2 3 of confidentiality to those former clients? 4 Do you understand that? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I do. THE COURT: Are you aware that Mr. Lazzaro, on account 6 7 of his prior representations of Mr. Jordan and Mr. Walter, might give you advice that is different from the advice he 8 9 otherwise might have? 10 Do you understand that is a possibility? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Do you understand, for example, that it is 13 possible that an attorney in Mr. Lazzaro's position might 14 discourage you in the course of your cooperation from fully 15 disclosing all the incriminating information you have regarding those former clients of his? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Again, I'm not saying this to impugn 19 Mr. Lazzaro. Anybody in this situation, I would be asking the 20 exact same questions about. 21 You understand that? 2.2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you now, I put 24 questions to you. I'm sorry, one more question.

Do you understand that if Mr. Lazzaro were to lead you

25

to not tell the truth in your meetings with the government, that could then subject you to consequences, including the potential termination of your cooperation with the government, cooperation agreement with the government?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I understand.

THE COURT: All right. Now, let me turn the floor to you.

Part of the purpose of this Curcio proceeding is for a judge to make sure that the defendant understands the nature of the conflict. I have reviewed the ones that the government thought of, the ones I was able to think of with you.

I would like you now to tell me in your own words what your understanding is of the potential conflict of interest presented by this situation.

THE DEFENDANT: OK. Um, your Honor -- um, I don't see any potential conflict in this situation because Mr. Lazzaro never told me any confidential information from Mr. Jordan or Mr. Walter, and from my understanding is that Mr. Jordan pleaded guilty this morning. I pleaded guilty January 23.

THE COURT: Look, Mr. Hernandez, first of all, Mr. Walter has not pled guilty.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, Mr. Jordan. Sorry.

THE COURT: No, no. You said it right. But, look, the point is, I'm asking you not whether there is, in fact, going to be any compromise in the ability of Mr. Lazzaro, in

the work that Mr. Lazzaro does on your behalf if permitted to represent you. I'm asking you if there is a potential conflict. I need to understand that you understand the potential conflict. I appreciate you have confidence in Mr. Lazzaro. That is not the issue here.

THE DEFENDANT: No, I do understand.

THE COURT: Please, if you need to take a moment with Ms. Florio, please do so, but the question I'm asking for you is, I need to make sure you get it. I need to make sure that you understand what, in theory, the risk you're taking on is by being represented by somebody who represents two codefendants, and I need to make sure you're able to articulate this in your own words.

THE DEFENDANT: OK. Can I get a second?

THE COURT: Do you want to take a moment with

Ms. Florio?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

(Defendant conferring with counsel)

THE DEFENDANT: Um, I understand the conflict in the situation I'm in, knowing that if Mr. Lazzaro told me to withhold any information or provide any information about Mr. Walter or Mr. Jordan. I know that could be a conflict with any of the proffers I did with the government. My cooperation agreement could be terminated, and there was nothing

Mr. Lazzaro could tell me that would benefit any of my information that I provided the government.

THE COURT: Look, do you understand that, in theory,
Mr. Lazzaro's advice to you might be affected by the fact that
two of the people you may be talking about are former clients
of his?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand that.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the advice he might give you might be potentially different from what a lawyer who hadn't previously represented those two people would give you?

THE DEFENDANT: I do understand that, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Do you understand that if that led you to say something, for example, to the government that was less than fully accurate or, for that matter, to testify in a way that was less than fully accurate, that could have very severe consequences for you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I understand.

THE COURT: Do you understand that one danger to you is that none of us here can foresee all of the possible conflicts that could arise because Mr. Lazzaro previously represented two people who are codefendants in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In other words, we're all doing our best to identify situations or scenarios that could arise, but cases take funny turns, and we may all sitting here today in late

March not being able to foresee where the case will be six months from now. I can't foresee every way in which the multiple roles Mr. Lazzaro has played in connection with defendants in this indictment could ultimately hurt you, but there may be things we are not thinking of or can't foresee now.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I understand.

THE COURT: Do you understand that as a defendant in a criminal case, you are entitled to the assistance of an attorney whose loyalty to you is undivided, who is not subject to any factor that might in any way intrude upon the attorney's loyalty to your interests?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In other words, you understand that you are entitled to an attorney who has only your interests in mind and not the interests of any other client?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Have you received any inducements or any promises or any threats with regard to your choice of counsel in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you consulted with any attorney other than Mr. Lazzaro about the dangers to you presented by this potential conflict of interest?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Who is that? 2 3 THE DEFENDANT: Ms. Dawn Florio. 4 THE COURT: All right. How much time have you spent 5 speaking with Ms. Florio about this issue? 6 THE DEFENDANT: It was about six times. What she 7 said. 8 THE COURT: Her estimate is about right? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. There about, yeah. 10 THE COURT: Did you feel like you spent enough time 11 with her to really get to the bottom of the issues here? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Were you satisfied with the quality of her 14 quidance to you? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. You have a right under the law 16 17 to consult with an attorney who is free from any conflict of interest about this issue, and Ms. Florio is that attorney. 18 Do you understand that if you want additional time to 19 20 confer with her about the issue, I will give that to you. 21 there is anything that has happened, for example, in our 22 discussions so far today that leads you to want to pause and 23 spend more time with Ms. Florio about the issue, I will be glad 24 to give you that time. 25 Do you understand that that is available to you, if

you want it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I do understand.

THE COURT: All right. I'm prepared to adjourn the remainder of this proceeding so that you could continue your conversation with Ms. Florio about the potential conflict of interest that I've described to you today.

Ms. Florio, I take it you're still available to Mr. Hernandez for that purpose?

MS. FLORIO: I am.

THE COURT: All right. Would you prefer to adjourn so you can give additional thought to that matter, or are you prepared to continue and give me as they say your final answer now?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I'll give a final answer.

THE COURT: All right. In other words, you feel like you've given enough thought to the issue to let me know, and I'm about to put the question to you, whether or not you waive your right to a conflict-free counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. After considering all that

I have said today about the ways in which Mr. Lazzaro's prior
representation of Mr. Jordan and Mr. Walter may adversely
affect you in this case, do you believe that it is in your best
interest to continue with him alongside Ms. Florio as your
attorney?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Do you understand that by choosing to 3 continue with Mr. Lazzaro as your attorney, you are waiving 4 your right to be represented solely by an attorney who has no 5 conflict of interest? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Are you knowingly and voluntarily waiving 8 your right to conflict-free representation? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Do you agree to waive any post-conviction 11 argument on appeal or otherwise that by virtue of Mr. Lazzaro's 12 prior representation of Mr. Jordan or Mr. Walter, you were 13 denied effective assistance of counsel by Mr. Lazzaro? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything that I have 16 said that you wish to have explained further? 17 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Government, do you believe there are any 19 additional questions I need to put to the defendant? 20 MR. WARREN: No, your Honor. Thank you. 21 THE COURT: Ms. Florio, do you? 22 MS. FLORIO: No, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. I have carefully examined 24 Mr. Hernandez on the issues at hand. I've also been very 25 attentive in watching him and listening to him and evaluating

the quality of his responses. It is clear to me that he understands the nature of the problem presented here. It is also quite clear to me that he spent a lot of productive time with Ms. Florio working through the possible angles and possible issues here.

I find that Mr. Hernandez has knowingly and voluntarily and willfully waived his right to conflict-free representation. I therefore authorize Mr. Lazzaro to resume representation of Mr. Hernandez.

It is my expectation that, Ms. Florio, you are in it for the long haul and will be jointly representing Mr. Hernandez throughout this case, is that correct?

MS. FLORIO: That is correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Hernandez, I'll just say the following to you: You're fortunate to have not one, but two fine lawyers represent you.

If there is any point at which a subject comes up where any of the concerns that I have raised with you or any other concern of a similar nature, that is to Mr. Lazzaro's guidance to you could be affected by his prior representation, anything like that ever comes up, one of the advantages of having Ms. Florio on the team is that she does not labor under any such conflict.

So keep in mind that this is something you should continue to be mindful of. If there is ever a point you have

J3SsHERc any concern about the independence of Mr. Lazzaro's advice, you should by all means take up the matter at hand independently with Ms. Florio. Do you understand? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I do. THE COURT: Anything further from any counsel? MR. WARREN: No, your Honor. MS. FLORIO: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. We stand adjourned. (Adjourned)